### **REMARKS**

5

This reply encompasses a bona fide attempt to address the rejections raised by the Office Action and presents amendments as well as reasons why the Applicant(s) believe that the claimed invention is novel and unobvious over the closest prior art of record, thereby placing the present application in a condition for allowance.

## Regarding Claim Status

Claims 1, 4-25, 30-38, and 41-52 were examined.

Claims 1, 4-25, 30, 31, 33-38, 41-49, 51 and 52 were rejected.

10 Claims 32 and 50 were objected to.

Claims 1-52 are canceled.

Claims 53-70 are new. No new matter is added.

#### Regarding the Claim Objections

15 The Office Action has objected to claims 32 and 50 for being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The Applicant has canceled claims 32 and 50, therefore these objections are now moot.

## 20 Regarding the Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 101

The Office Action has rejected claims 36-37 and 51-52 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Applicant has canceled claims 36-37 and 51-52, therefore these rejections are now moot. The Applicant has addressed this issue in the NEW independent claim 53 discussed below.

#### 5 Regarding the Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112

The Office Action has rejected claims 14-25 and 34-35 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter, which the applicant regards as the invention are withdrawn in view of amendments filed by applicants to the instant claims filed 14 April 2008.

10

#### **ENABLEMENT**

The Office Action has rejected claims 7-11, 22-25, 44-47 and 49 for failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

The Applicant has canceled claims 7-11, 22-25, 44-47 and 49, therefore these rejections are moot.

#### **INDEFINITENESS**

The Office Action has rejected claims 10-11, 17-21, 34-35 and 47 being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter, which the applicant regards as the invention.

The Applicant has canceled claims 10-11, 17-21, 34-35 and 47, therefore these rejections are now moot.

### Regarding the Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102

5 The Office Action has rejected claims 1, 4-6, 36-38, 41-43 and 51-52 as being anticipated by Ostergaard (US Pat. 7,069,068; issued 27 June 2006; entered national stage 15 November 2001).

The Applicant has canceled claims 1, 4-6, 36-38, 41-43 and 51-52, therefore these rejections are now moot.

# Regarding the Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103

20

The Office Action has rejected claims 7-9 as being unpatentable over Ostergaard in view of Folger [Elements of Chemical Reaction Engineering, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., 1992, chapter 13, section 13.4, pages 729-737] are withdrawn due to reconsideration and the enablement rejection recited by the Office Action.

The Office Action has rejected claims 12-16 as being unpatentable over Ostergaard as applied to claims 1, 4-6, 26-29, 36-38, 41-43 and 51-52 above, and further in view of Fogler [Elements of Chemical Reaction Engineering, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., 1992, chapter 13, section 13.4, pages 729-737].

The Applicant has canceled claims 1, 4-6, 26-29, 36-38, 41-43 and 51-52, therefore these

rejections are now moot.

### **NEWLY APPLIED REJECTIONS**

Claims 30-31 and 48 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ostergaard as applied to claims 1, 4-6. 26-29, 36-38, 41-43 and 51-52 above, and further in view of Meaney at al. (US Pat. 5,924,987; issued 20 July 1999; filed 6 October 1997; on IDS) in view of Wu et al. (US PGPUB 2007/0112264 A1; issued 17 May 2007).

The Applicant has canceled claims 30-31 and 48, therefore these rejections are now moot.

## Regarding NEW claims 53-70

The Applicant respectfully avers that the new claims 53-70 are novel and non-obvious over the cited prior art. No new matter is added.

15

5

### Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the invention is novel and unobvious over the relevant prior art of record. This Reply is submitted to be complete and proper in that it places the present application in a condition for allowance without adding new matter. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance of all pending claims 53-70 are therefore respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

10

5

/ James Parris / Reg. No. 51,135

James Parris
Reg. No. 51,135
LUMEN Intellectual Property Services
2345 Yale Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306-1429
Phone: (650) 424-0100
Fax: (650) 424-0141

20

15